



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,485	03/17/2006	Yoshihiko Minachi	1002.105	2276
95674 7590 06/03/2010				
Adli Law Group P.C. 633 West Fifth Street Suite 2600 Los Angeles, CA 90071				
EXAMINER				
CHAU, LINDA N				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1785				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/03/2010		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/538,485

**Applicant(s)**

MINACHI ET AL.

**Examiner**

LINDA CHAU

**Art Unit**

1785

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 May 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-6,8,9 and 11-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-6,8,9 and 11-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-06)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-9, and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Yamamoto et al. (*Magnetic Properties of Ba-Zn-System W-Type Hexagonal Ferrite Magnets*).**

Regarding claims 1-2, 4-6, 9, 14, Yamamoto teaches sintered magnets and powders (pg. 763) consisting of the compound  $\text{Ba}_{1.092}\text{Zn}_{1.725}\text{Fe}^{2+}_{0.410}\text{Fe}^{3+}_{15.848}\text{O}_{27}$  (Abstract) based on the amount of 4.0 wt% of BaO (Table 2), in which the compound doesn't teach the amounts as claimed. However, this compound is a result effective variable.

The examiner deems that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have determined the optimum value of the results effective variable to be as presently claimed, through routine experimentation, especially given the knowledge in the art that Yamamoto teaches that BaO content affects the  $\text{Zn}^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$ , or  $\text{Fe}^{3+}$  (pg. 765) and that the addition of BaO can be of 3.0 wt% or more in order to contribute the stabilization of the W phase of the magnets (pg. 758). *In re Boesch*, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980); *In re Geisler*, 116 F. 3d 1465, 43 USPQ2d 1362, 1365 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *In re After*, 220 F.2d, 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

Furthermore, given that Yamamoto disclose magnetic powder or magnet as presently claimed, it is clear that the magnetic powder intrinsically possess saturation magnetization as presently claimed while the magnet would intrinsically possess saturation magnetization, squareness, and residual magnetic flux density as presently claimed.

Regarding claims 8 and 11-13, given that Yamamoto disclose magnetic powder or magnet as presently claimed, it is clear that the magnetic powder intrinsically possess saturation magnetization as presently claimed while the magnet would intrinsically possess saturation magnetization, squareness, and residual magnetic flux density as presently claimed.

**Claim 1, 8, 11, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al. (*Magnetic Properties of Ba-Zn-System W-Type Hexagonal Ferrite Magnets*) and in view of Toyota (US 5,866,028).**

Regarding claim 1, Yamamoto teaches a magnet powder as set forth above, however, doesn't teach that the ferrite magnet powder has a saturation magnetization of 5.0 kG or more.

Toyota teaches a W-type ferrite magnet (Abstract) having a saturation magnetization of 5.0 kG (col. 7, line 65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have Yamamoto's magnet to be of 5.0 kG of saturation magnetization in order to fabricate a material with stronger ferromagnetism (col. 1, lines 46-47).

Regarding claims 8 and 11, Yamamoto teaches a magnetic powder as set forth above. Toyota teaches a W-type ferrite magnet (Abstract) having a saturation magnetization of 5.0 kG (col. 7, line 65) but doesn't teach a saturation magnetization of 5.1 kG or more.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to optimize Toyota's magnetization to 5.1 kG in Yamamoto's magnet, since Toyota teaches that having a larger degree of magnetization will have a much stronger ferromagnetism (col. 1, lines 39-47).

Regarding claim 13, Toyota teaches a saturation magnetization of 5.0 kG and a residual magnetic flux density of 4.8 kG (col. 7, line 65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have Yamamoto's magnet to be of 5.0 kG of saturation magnetization in order to fabricate stronger ferromagnetism (col. 1, lines 46-47).

Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have Yamamoto's magnet to be of 4.2 kG in residual magnetic flux density as taught by Toyota in order to achieve excellent magnetic property (col. 2, lines 4-11).

**Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al. (*Magnetic Properties of Ba-Zn-System W-Type Hexagonal Ferrite Magnets*) and in view of Taguchi et al. (US 6,258,290).**

Regarding claim 12, Yamamoto teaches a magnet powder as set forth above but doesn't teach a saturation magnetization of 5.0 kG or more and a squareness of 80% or more.

Toyota teaches a W-type ferrite magnet (Abstract) having a saturation magnetization of 5.0 kG (col. 7, line 65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have Yamamoto's magnet to be of 5.0 kG of saturation magnetization in order to fabricate stronger ferromagnetism (col. 1, lines 46-47).

Further, Taguchi teaches a magnet powder of having a squareness of more than 80% (Table 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have Yamamoto's magnet be of 80% in squareness, since Taguchi teaches that it will provide excellence in demagnetization (col. 33, lines 52-53).

**Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Yamamoto et al. (*Magnetic Properties of Ba-Zn-System W-Type Hexagonal Ferrite Magnets*) and in view of Kijima et al. (JP 02-180004; herein referred to under the English translation PTO 09-1223).**

Regarding claim 15-16, Yamamoto teaches the ferrite magnet powder as claimed, however fails to teach that A is Sr and/or B.

Kijima teaches a ferrite magnet powder has a composition of  $M\text{Fe}_{2+x}\text{Fe}_{16-x}\text{O}_{27}$ , wherein M is consisting of Ba, Sr, and Pb (claim 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have Yamamoto's elements A to be Sr and/or Ba, as taught by Kijima, in order to improve the magnetic characteristics of the magnets (pg. 14).

Regarding claim 17, Yamamoto teaches the ferrite magnet powder as claimed, as set forth above, however, fails to teach that is a bonded magnet and contains a resin phase. However, it is noted that the term "bonded magnet" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

Kijima teaches ferrite powders with similar compounds and a resin phase that disperses and retains the ferrite magnetic powder (claim 2). Further, Kijima uses the magnetic powders in plastic magnets or bonded magnets and teaches that it known in the art to incorporate the ferrite magnet powder in sintered magnets (pg. 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that Yamamoto's magnets contain a resin phase, as taught by Kijima, in order to produce the magnets effectively (pg. 6 and 9).

**Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al. (*Magnetic Properties of Ba-Zn-System W-Type Hexagonal Ferrite Magnets*), in view of Kijima et al. (JP 02-180004; herein referred to under the English translation PTO 09-1223), and further in view of Taguchi et al. (US 6,258,290).**

Regarding claim 18, Yamamoto teaches a magnet powder as set forth above in claim 1 but Yamamoto doesn't teach that the ferrite magnet powder may be used in a magnetic layer of a magnetic recording medium.

Taguchi teaches a hexagonal magnet ferrite powder is used in a magnetic layer over a substrate (col. 9, lines 44-49).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have Yamamoto's magnet powder to be used in a magnetic layer as taught by Taguchi in order to have multiple usages of the magnet powders.

**Claim 19-20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al. (*Magnetic Properties of Ba-Zn-System W-Type Hexagonal Ferrite Magnets*), in view of Kijima et al. (JP 02-180004; herein referred to under the English translation PTO 09-1223), in view of Taguchi et al. (US 6,258,290), and further in view of Toyota (US 5,866,028).**

Regarding claim 19-20, Yamamoto in view of Taguchi teaches a magnetic recording medium as set forth above but doesn't teach a saturation magnetization of 5.2 kG.

Toyota teaches a residual magnetic density is of 4.8 kG and a saturation magnetization of 5.0 kG but doesn't explicitly teach a saturation magnetization can be of 5.2 kG or more (col. 7, line 65).

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to optimize Toyota's magnetization to 5.2 kG in the recording medium, since Toyota



teaches that having a larger degree of magnetization will have a much stronger ferromagnetism which will be optimal in a magnetic recording medium (col. 1, lines 39-47).

**Claims 1-9 and 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kijima et al. (JP 02-180004; herein referred to under the English translation PTO 09-1223), and in view of Yamamoto et al. (*Magnetic Properties of Ba-Zn-System W-Type Hexagonal Ferrite Magnets*).**

Regarding claims 1, 3-6, 9, and 14-17, Kijima teaches a ferrite magnet powder have a composition of  $M\text{Fe}^{2+}_{2+x}\text{Fe}^{3+}_{16-x}\text{O}_{27}$ , wherein M is consisting of Ba, Sr, and Pb, and  $x = +0.05$  to  $-0.10$ . Further, Kijima discloses that Zn is added to the compound such that zinc is 1.0-10mol% of  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  (claim 1). Kijima doesn't explicitly disclose that Zn is in a form  $\text{Zn}_{(\text{ax})}$  described by the limitation. However, on the one hand, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the range of zinc as described by the applicant based upon the mole percentages. In light of the amount of Zn disclosed by Kijima, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use amounts of Zn and  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$ , including those presently claimed, in order to produce stabilized W phase that does not deteriorate (pg. 7). On the other hand, given that Kijima discloses ferrite magnet powder with similar properties and functions, as presently claimed, it would appear that the composition of zinc would overlap the range claimed by the applicant. Furthermore, Kijima also teaches a resin phase that disperses and retains the ferrite magnetic powder (claim 2). Further, Kijima uses the magnetic powders in plastic magnets or bonded magnets and teaches that it known in the art to

incorporate the ferrite magnet powder in sintered magnets (pg. 3). However, Kijima further emphasizes that plastic magnets have various advantages over sintered magnets (pg. 3-4).

Kijima fails to teach the composition of  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$ , since it has a range of 1.9-2.05 versus the presently claim range of 0.45-1.54.

Yamamoto teaches magnetic powders (pg. 763) consisting of the compound  $\text{Ba}_{1.092}\text{Zn}_{1.725}\text{Fe}^{2+}_{0.410}\text{Fe}^{3+}_{15.848}\text{O}_{27}$  (Abstract) based on the amount of 4.0 wt% of BaO (Table 2), in which the compound doesn't teach the amounts as claimed. However, this compound is a result effective variable. the examiner deems that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have determined the optimum value of the results effective variable to be as presently claimed, through routine experimentation, especially given the knowledge in the art that Yamamoto teaches that BaO content affects the  $\text{Zn}^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$ , or  $\text{Fe}^{3+}$  (pg. 765) and that the addition of BaO can be *of 3.0 wt% or more* in order to contribute the stabilization of the W phase of the magnets (pg. 758). *In re Boesch, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980); In re Geisler, 116 F. 3d 1465, 43 USPQ2d 1362, 1365 (Fed. Cir. 1997); In re After, 220 F.2d, 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to reduce the  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  range of Kijima to be of 1.54, as claimed, since Yamamoto teaches that the compound is a result effect variable and in order to contribute the stabilization of the W phase of the magnets (pg. 758).

Furthermore, given that Kijima in combination with Yamamoto disclose magnetic powder or magnet as presently claimed, it is clear that the magnetic powder would inherently or intrinsically possess saturation magnetization as presently claimed while the magnet would

inherently or intrinsically possess saturation magnetization, squareness, and residual magnetic flux density as presently claimed.

Regarding claim 2, Kijima teaches that the powder is characterized in a W-type ferrite phase (pg. 7).

Regarding claim 8 and 11-13, given that Kijima disclose magnetic powder or magnet as presently claimed, it is clear that the magnetic powder would inherently or intrinsically possess saturation magnetization as presently claimed while the magnet would inherently or intrinsically possess saturation magnetization, squareness, and residual magnetic flux density as presently claimed.

**Claim 1, 8, 11, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kijima et al. (JP 02-180004; herein referred to under the English translation PTO 09-1223), in view of Yamamoto et al. (*Magnetic Properties of Ba-Zn-System W-Type Hexagonal Ferrite Magnets*), and further in view of Toyota (US 5,866,028).**

Regarding claim 7, Kijima in combination with Yamamoto teaches a magnet powder as set forth above, however, doesn't teach that the ferrite magnet powder has a saturation magnetization of 5.0 kG or more.

Toyota teaches a W-type ferrite magnet (Abstract) having a saturation magnetization of 5.0 kG (col. 7, line 65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have Kijima magnet to be of 5.0 kG of saturation magnetization in order to fabricate stronger ferromagnetism (col. 1, lines 46-47).

Regarding claims 8 and 11, Kijima teaches a magnetic powder as set forth above. Toyota teaches a W-type ferrite magnet (Abstract) having a saturation magnetization of 5.0 kG (col. 7, line 65) but doesn't teach a saturation magnetization of 5.1 kG or more.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to optimize Toyota's magnetization to 5.1 kG in Kijima's magnet, since Toyota teaches that having a larger degree of magnetization will have a much stronger ferromagnetism (col. 1, lines 39-47).

Regarding claim 13, Toyota teaches a saturation magnetization of 5.0 kG and a residual magnetic flux density of 4.8 kG (col. 7, line 65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have Kijima magnet to be of 5.0 kG of saturation magnetization in order to fabricate stronger ferromagnetism (col. 1, lines 46-47).

Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have Kijima's magnet to be of 4.2 kG in residual magnetic flux density as taught by Toyota in order to achieve excellent magnetic property (col. 2, lines 4-11).

**Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kijima et al. (JP 02-180004; herein referred to under the English translation PTO 09-1223), in view of**

**Yamamoto et al. (*Magnetic Properties of Ba-Zn-System W-Type Hexagonal Ferrite Magnets*), in view of Toyota (US 5,866,028), and further in view of Taguchi et al. (US 6,258,290).**

Regarding claim 12, Kijima in combination with Yamamoto teaches a magnet powder as set forth above but doesn't teach a saturation magnetization of 5.0 kG or more and a squareness of 80% or more.

Toyota teaches a W-type ferrite magnet (Abstract) having a saturation magnetization of 5.0 kG (col. 7, line 65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have Kijima magnet to be of 5.0 kG of saturation magnetization in order to fabricate stronger ferromagnetism (col. 1, lines 46-47).

Further, Taguchi teaches a magnet powder of having a squareness of more than 80% (Table 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have Kijima's magnet be of 80% in squareness, since Taguchi teaches that it will provide excellence in demagnetization (col. 33, lines 52-53).

**Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kijima et al. (JP 02-180004; herein referred to under the English translation PTO 09-1223), in view of Yamamoto et al. (*Magnetic Properties of Ba-Zn-System W-Type Hexagonal Ferrite Magnets*), and further in view of Taguchi et al. (US 6,258,290).**

Regarding claim 18, Kijima in combination of Yamamoto teaches a magnet powder as set forth above in claim 1 but Kijima doesn't teach that the ferrite magnet powder may be used in a magnetic layer of a magnetic recording medium.

Taguchi teaches a hexagonal magnet ferrite powder is used in a magnetic layer over a substrate (col. 9, lines 44-49).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have Kijima's magnet powder to be used in a magnetic layer as taught by Taguchi in order to have multiple usages of the magnet powders.

**Claims 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kijima et al. (JP 02-180004; herein referred to under the English translation PTO 09-1223), in view of Yamamoto et al. (*Magnetic Properties of Ba-Zn-System W-Type Hexagonal Ferrite Magnets*), in view of Taguchi et al. (US 6,258,290), and further in view of Toyota (US 5,866,028).**

Regarding claim 19-20, Kijima in combination of Yamamoto and in view of Taguchi teaches a magnetic recording medium as set forth above but doesn't teach a saturation magnetization of 5.2 kG.

Toyota teaches a residual magnetic density is of 4.8 kG and a saturation magnetization of 5.0 kG but doesn't explicitly teach a saturation magnetization can be of 5.2 kG or more (col. 7, line 65).

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to optimize Toyota's magnetization to 5.2 kG in the recording medium, since Toyota

teaches that having a larger degree of magnetization will have a much stronger ferromagnetism which will be optimal in a magnetic recording medium (col. 1, lines 39-47).

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant argues that Yamamoto's compound,  $\text{Ba}_{1.092}\text{Zn}_{1.723}\text{Fe}^{2+}_{0.410}\text{Fe}^{3+}_{15.848}\text{O}_{27}$  (Abstract), does not overlap the  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  and the M range of the present invention. The examiner agrees that Yamamoto doesn't explicitly teach the compound as claimed, however, this compound is *based* on the amount of 4.0 wt% of BaO (Table 2), which therefore the compound is a result effective variable. Thus, that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have determined the optimum value of the result effective variable to be as presently claimed, through routine experimentation, especially given the knowledge in the art that Yamamoto teaches that BaO content affects the  $\text{Zn}^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$ , or  $\text{Fe}^{3+}$  (pg. 765) and that the addition of BaO can be of 3.0 wt% or more in order to contribute the stabilization of the W phase of the magnets (pg. 758). *In re Boesch*, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980); *In re Geisler*, 116 F. 3d 1465, 43 USPQ2d 1362, 1365 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *In re After*, 220 F.2d, 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

Further, given that Yamamoto disclose magnetic powder or magnet as presently claimed, it is clear that the magnetic powder intrinsically possess saturation magnetization as presently claimed while the magnet would intrinsically possess saturation magnetization, squareness, and residual magnetic flux density as presently claimed.

Applicant argues that Kijima fails to teach the compound with the ranges as claimed. The examiner agrees that Kijima teaches away the  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$  range, however, Yamamoto has been applied to be used as a teaching reference that obtaining these specific compound is a result effective variable. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kijima's compound, with respect to iron and zinc, to the teachings of the broad compound range of Yamamoto based on the amount of BaO in order to stabilize the W phase of the magnets (pg. 758).

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.



Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LINDA CHAU whose telephone number is (571)270-5835. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 8:00-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Ruthkosky can be reached on (571) 272-1291. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Linda Chau  
/LC/

/Holly Rickman/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1785